

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on April 29, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the specification has been amended to correct certain informalities.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract for including legal phraseology. In response, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claim 8, as well as having reference numerals 110 and 100 in FIGs 2-3 pointing to the same object. In response, FIGs 2-3 have been amended to move reference numeral 100 towards the middle, and

to include dashed lines showing a transformer 150 driving a rectifier 155, as recited in claim 8, in FIG 3. Further, the specification has been amended for conformance with the changes to FIG 3. A replacement sheet including FIG 2 is enclosed. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the enclosed proposed drawing change and withdrawal of the drawing objection.

In the Office Action, claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 6-7 have been amended to remove the alleged informality noted by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6-7 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,434,477 (Crouse). Further, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Crouse in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,661 (Bogdan). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Crouse in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,608,523 (Nilssen). Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Crouse in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,747,967 (Muljadi). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are patentable over Crouse, Bogdan, Nilssen and Muljadi for at least the following reasons.

In rejecting claim 3 on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly noted that Crouse does not teach or suggest a series arrangement of an inductor and an AC mains source across the output branch. Nilssen is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Crouse.

Nilssen is directed to a series-resonant ballast, where the voltage from an AC power source S, shown in FIGs 1-2, is applied directly across a ballast circuit. The ballast circuit consists of a series-combination of an inductor (L) and a capacitor (C), with a gas discharge lamp connected in parallel with the capacitor. As specifically recited on column 2, line 67 to column 3, line 2, the AC power source S provides a voltage at a frequency of 30kHz, which is the resonant frequency of the L-C series circuit.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

an AC mains source connected across the output branch for providing AC power having a mains frequency which is less than a switching frequency of the two switches.

An AC mains source connected across the output branch for providing AC power having a mains frequency which is less than a switching frequency of the two switches, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Crouse, Nilssen, and combination thereof. Rather, Nilssen merely discloses having a high frequency source connected across the lamp, namely, having a frequency of 30kHz which is the resonant frequency of the L-C series circuit. Bogdan and Muljadi are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Crouse and Nilssen.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of

argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
July 29, 2008

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIGs 2-3)

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101